



AD HOC WORK GROUP
PRINEVILLE RESERVOIR
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN/MASTER PLAN

Meeting No. 3 Summary

Meeting Date: August 16, 2001

I. MEETING ATTENDEES

AHWG Members:

** denotes attendance at third AHWG meeting*

- Dr. Diane Bohle, Chamber of Commerce
- Bill Crawford, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD)*
- Jason Dedrick, Crooked River Watershed Council*
- Brian Ferry, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)*
- Boyd Goodpaster, South Shore Resident*
- Amy Green, Resident (Representing Dispersed Campers)*
- Laura Hawes, Prineville Resort*
- Jim Hensley, Crook County Undersheriff*
- Eileen Obermiller, Deschutes County Planning Department
- Larry Rasmussen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)*
- Russell Rhoden, Ochoco Irrigators*
- John Swanson, U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (alternate for Berry Phelps)*
- Wayne Shuyler, Oregon State Marine Board
- Dan Skillings, Central Oregon Bass Club
- Brigitte Whipple, Cultural Anthropologist, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs*
- Bill Zelenka, Crook County Community Development Department (new as of 8-17-01)

Planning Team:

- Vicki Kellerman, Reclamation, PN Regional Office, Team Leader*
- Connie Wensman, Reclamation, Realty Specialist*
- Patti Llewellyn, Reclamation, Lands & Recreation Program Manager*
- Chuck Korson, Reclamation, Lower Columbia Area Office, Natural Resource Specialist*
- Kristen Stallman, OPRD, Master Planner*
- Kevin Butterbaugh, EDAW, Project Manager and Principal Planner, Consultant Team*
- Jim Keany, EDAW, Terrestrial Ecologist and EA Coordinator, Consultant Team*
- Peter Carr, EDAW, Public Involvement Specialist, Consultant Team*
- John Petrovsky, JPA, Public Involvement Specialist, Consultant Team*

In addition, Tim Deboodt, representing the Crook County Agricultural Extension Service, was invited to sit in on this meeting and provide comments on issues related to grazing.

II. INTRODUCTIONS/AGENDA

This document summarizes the third Ad Hoc Work Group (AHWG) Meeting for the Prineville Reservoir RMP/Master Plan, held August 16, 2001 in Prineville at the Crook County Library.

John Petrovsky (JPA) began the meeting by reviewing the evening's agenda. The primary intent of this meeting was to gather AHWG comments on the Draft Problem Statement, a document prepared to summarize input received on key issues to be addressed in the RMP/MP. The Draft Problem Statement had been distributed earlier to the AHWG, and it was assumed that each member had taken time to review its contents. In addition to Problem Statement discussions, the secondary purpose of this meeting was to briefly summarize opportunity and constraints mapping prepared for the project, as well as list the draft Goals developed for the plan.

Before launching into the Problem Statement discussion, John P. briefly discussed recent additions to and withdrawals from the AHWG. Ed Hodges decided to no longer participate in the group, saying that the interests of the Oregon Hunters Association were being adequately represented. Brigitte Whipple is a new member, representing the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation. Jason Dedrick is a new AHWG member, replacing Tina Whitman on the Crooked River Watershed Council. Bill Zelenka, Crook County Planning Director, was added as a new member the day after this third AHWG meeting, serving as a permanent alternate for Mike McCabe.

John P. also noted the local media coverage of a proposal to limit boating speeds to 5 mph (no wake zone) in the vicinity of Roberts Bay; this Oregon State Marine Board proposal is separate from the RMP/MP process but will be noted. Lastly, John P. summarized the overall RMP planning process, noting our progress to date.

III. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT PROBLEM STATEMENT

Dialog regarding the Draft Problem Statement (PS) that occurred at this meeting will be used to update the PS; a revised PS will be prepared and distributed to the AHWG. Discussion at the meeting ranged from minor wording of certain portions of the Draft PS, to longer discussions about particular issues and how they should be presented in the PS and subsequently addressed in the RMP/MP. In addition, there were many issues raised in the Draft PS that elicited no specific comments.

Rather than providing a comprehensive account of all comments on the Draft PS, this meeting summary focuses on the more significant discussions that occurred. Minor wording changes will be reflected in the revised PS but not noted here. In addition, the same numbering system and order used in the PS is used here (e.g., "A.1.1").

Overall, the issues that received the most attention at the AHWG meeting included: (1) grazing management (A.1.1), (2) juniper management (A.1.2), and (3) law enforcement and public safety (C.4.1). These are described in detail below, along with other significant dialog. Later in the meeting, John P. noted that tonight's meeting "races through" the various issues, assuming that AHWG members have reviewed it; it is entirely appropriate to continue dialog on particular issues outside of the AHWG setting; that is, if you want more information on a particular subject, just ask.

A. Natural and Cultural Resources

A.1.1 Protection of natural resources; fish and wildlife enhancement needs

State Wildlife Area (SWA)

1. Recreation

Jim Hensley noted that the Draft PS lacks any mention of the potential use of ORVs by disabled people to access Reclamation lands. Consideration for access for people with disabilities needs to be addressed. John P. will revise the PS to reflect this concern.

2. Cattle Grazing

A substantial amount of discussion time was devoted to the issue of cattle grazing. Main participants in this dialog included John Swanson, Tim Deboodt, Brian Ferry, and Boyd Goodpaster. John P. will substantially revise the PS discussion on grazing based on the dialog that occurred. Key points are summarized below.

The grazing issue deals with two primary levels - access and potential impacts to natural resources. These issues need to be addressed clearly and separately. Access relates to the various grazing permits, fencing (or lack of) on lands in the study area, site-specific trespass, and Reclamation policy (note: there was some debate at the meeting specifically on Reclamation's policies and former wording in the 1992 RMP regarding grazing access). Potential impacts relate to what effects can occur when cattle are present; related issues include soil types, riparian vegetation, erosion, water quality, and noxious weeds.

John Swanson and Tim Deboodt stressed that they consider the Draft PS wording on grazing to be inaccurate and misleading. Specifically, they noted that the PS refers to "damage" in the SWA caused by cattle presence and grazing. However, data collected over 30 years on BLM lands in the study area demonstrate that the presence of cattle has not degraded natural resources (e.g., via erosion and water quality). Rather, the managed cattle presence has contributed to watershed recovery, particularly in the realm of eliminating the spread of noxious weeds (according to BLM data). They therefore asked that Reclamation more clearly define in the PS what is meant by "damage," and present the issue more accurately. A dialog followed acknowledging that the assumption of cattle-caused damage might be more of an issue of perception than reality, but that the perception is definitely that cattle contribute to

erosion and degraded water quality. Tim also noted that designated Open Rangeland areas are specifically defined in Oregon Rules and Statutes (ORS).

Roberts Bay is a site-specific area where cattle presence is an issue. Boyd Goodpaster noted the residents' frustration that cattle are allowed to graze in the restricted wetland, whereas people are prohibited from recreating there. In such a case the public perception is one of management inconsistency and lack of fairness.

Specifically regarding cattle presence and impacts within the State Wildlife Area (SWA), Brian Ferry noted that ODFW has not witnessed any significant grazing-related damage in the last 6 or 7 years, saying that grazing could be a potential management tool for controlling the spread of noxious weeds. However, ODFW has not exercised this as a management tool in recent years. Brian cited a letter dated June 6, 2001, from ODFW to EDAW, clarifying this point.

A related issue dealt with fencing to prohibit livestock access. Brian noted that older fencing styles do not meet current requirements, especially regarding the bottom wire strand; fawns are particularly susceptible to being hindered by the bottom strand.

In addition to the resolution that the PS will be revised to better reflect such concerns and perspectives, Tim volunteered to conduct a grazing workshop or site visit, with the goal of informing people on site-specific conditions in the watershed.

A.1.2 Vegetation management

Another topic of significant discussion was the management of juniper in the study area. Like grazing, this issue involves a component of public perception, which will likely require clarification. That is, it might be necessary to educate the public on the scientific basis for site-specific treatments. Conversely, it would be helpful to incorporate public concerns into the planning process.

Boyd noted that the area's residents have many questions about why juniper are removed, citing such impacts as visual eyesores and fire hazards from downed trees. He also noted that juniper are a native species and therefore it seemed odd to cut them down. In response, it was noted that the density of today's juniper stands is far greater than in the past, primarily due to human intervention (fire control), and other factors.

It was noted that historical juniper management (in the form of clearcuts) differs substantially from today's methods, and that remnants of historical practices remain. It was also noted that, particularly with current methods, sites recover from a visual resource perspective over the course of 3 to 5 years.

Benefits of juniper management include both erosion reduction, as well as promotion of forage vegetation for area wildlife. Treatments are site-specific and vary depending on specific management goals on the landscape.

A.1.5 Noxious weed control

Brian Ferry recommended moving this subtopic into the broader topic of vegetation management (A.1.2). Tim mentioned that, in addition, the topic should address other species such as purple loosestrife and other weeds (both aquatic and terrestrial) inadvertently brought in by recreationists.

A.3 Cultural Resources

This was Brigitte Whipple's first attendance at an AHWG meeting. (Note: Reclamation and OPRD conducted a separate meeting and site visit with Tribal elders on August 9, 2001) After Brigitte reviewed the Draft PS treatment of cultural resources, she noted the following:

- The Tribe would like to be involved in archaeological field work (site testing) and monitoring efforts in the study area.
- As discussed on their site visit, the Tribe would like to see an ethnographic study, (oral history), incorporated into the planning process, specifically addressing the names of important places such as streamside sites.
- The Tribes want to ensure that access is maintained for Tribal cultural purposes (e.g., gathering plants).
- Clarification was requested on why there is a need to separate the discussions on Indian Trust Assets (ITAs) from the general category of cultural resources.

A.4 Scenic Resources

A.4.1 Viewshed

In addition to the visual concerns related to juniper management (discussed above), Boyd noted that new access roads create visual impacts, and these should be addressed in the plan.

B. Recreation and Access

B.1 General

B.1.1 Controlling recreation use levels (overuse)

Boyd and Amy Green questioned the PS statement that many Roberts Bay users come from the Portland metro area; Kristen Stallman noted that this information probably came from the informal questionnaire, and that we would delete the statement from the PS.

B.1.2 Existing facilities don't meet demand

Brian stated that the PS (and RMP) should clearly address the quantitative carrying capacity, as well as the potential management reaction. At issue is what will be done when use exceeds appropriate levels for resource protection.

Kristen noted that the PS should include more information on ADA compliance, such as the need for ADA fishing piers. Kevin noted that this comment might better fit on section A.4 (Access).

B.2 Land-Based Uses, Sites, and Facilities

B.2.4 Develop and control camping

Amy questioned the current PS wording stating that some people desire more developed facilities on the south shore; she noted that the region has many such developed areas, and that this user group wouldn't consider driving along 15 miles of a poor gravel road to access similar facilities. She commented that the cost of developing utilities and infrastructure for developed sites would prohibit any serious consideration of such facilities. Note that this issue overlaps with B.2.10 (South shore/Roberts Bay needs)

Brian suggested combining the B.2.4 subhead with the B.2.2 subhead (Improving existing sites without creating new sites), as well as with B.2.8 (Camping in non-designated areas). These all relate to the same issues.

B.2.7 Provision of unimproved/primitive sites (Roberts Bay)

Based on the above discussion, Vicki suggested that we add a statement in the PS that there is a contingency of folks who desire no improvements at Roberts Bay and are seeking a primitive camping experience.

B.3.1 Conflicts on the reservoir between user groups

Laura Hawes noted that the Resort doesn't own any houseboats, as the PS currently states. Any houseboats moored there are privately owned.

Regarding the statement that "Some conflicts could be reduced by enforcing...", Jim Hensley noted that conflicts currently ARE reduced by such enforcement.

B.3.2 Boat ramps

Boyd pointed out that the existing boat ramp on the south side (i.e., the Roberts Bay west ramp) is difficult to access and is generally muddy. Amy added that there is inadequate signage directing users. Laura noted that most of the stuck vehicles on the reservoir happen here, especially at lower water

levels.

B.4.1 Access road/transportation – improvements and changes

Jason Dedrick commented that he's been getting phone calls about the status of access to Bear Creek (now and in the future). The RMP/MP should address this access.

B.4.2 ORV management

John Swanson noted that there are various site-specific ORV prohibitions and closures on BLM lands in the area, not reflected in the current RMP wording. As an example, the area near Eagle Rock is restricted. It was agreed that all agencies should coordinate on the various restrictions,

closures, and prohibitions and clearly communicate these to the public, and that they should be stated in the RMP/MP.

B.4.5 Reopen the wetland

The issue of the Roberts Bay wetland was discussed, leading to some clarification. Amy and Boyd initially questioned its regulatory status as a wetland, stating that the site seemed to fit the definition of a riparian zone. Jim Keany explained that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has classified the area as a matrix of wetland and non-wetland areas. Consultant biologists later confirmed the NRCS findings and found that the area met the three regulatory requirements for a wetland - characteristics for the soil, vegetation, and water. It therefore must be considered (and managed) as a wetland from a regulatory perspective, including Presidential Executive Orders. Reclamation is obligated to manage it as a sensitive resource. John P. noted that certain uses were therefore incompatible by nature, such as vehicular access and camping. Kevin Butterbaugh noted that such a classification did not necessarily preclude a less invasive use, such as an interpretive trail.

C. Land Use Management & Implementation

C.1 Surrounding Land Use/Management

C.1.1 Reclamation/BLM land use management

John Swanson noted that BLM's upcoming RMP for lands surrounding the reservoir will not cover all of Reclamation's study area, just a portion; the PS should be reworded to reflect this fact.

Jim Hensley asked about ORV use in Millican Valley, wondering if these areas will remain open. The Sheriff's Office generally refers ORV users to that area. John Swanson confirmed that ORV access will remain open there. It was generally agreed that these ORV access areas should be better publicized, which would hopefully draw such use to appropriate areas and away from inappropriate areas (such as on Reclamation lands).

C.1.3 Private property rights

Boyd clarified that vehicle trespass on private property is an issue that should be addressed in the RMP. For example, some people actually cut fences on private property to gain access; other trespass occurs more readily in unfenced areas. Property owners obviously don't approve of such vandalism and trespass.

C.2 Facility/Services/Use Management

Brian recommended adding a general introduction to this section, clearly stating that Reclamation needs to balance people's desire to access this area with the need to protect natural and cultural resources. Overall, he stated that there is an overwhelming amount of use in the area that needs to be more effectively managed, especially in the future as the demand grows.

C.4 Implementation

C.4.1 Law enforcement/safety

AHWG members stressed that this was one of the most significant issues at the reservoir. Jim Hensley noted his concern regarding any potential funding cuts in the future; if funding contracts with Reclamation aren't renewed or funds are reduced, the Sheriff's ability to provide services will be jeopardized. He hopes to provide at the very least the current levels of patrol, ideally more. Boyd noted that the Sheriff's Office is doing a great job, and the situation is much better than in previous times; despite this, he noted that enforcement should be considered the No. 1 priority. Brian commented that increasing use levels and demand are to be expected in the future, and that adequate enforcement will therefore be needed to protect resources. He further noted that future funding should be, at a minimum, proportional to future demand. Laura stressed that enforcement seems to be thought of as a seasonal (i.e., peak season) issue; however, year round patrols are now necessary to deal with winter use, particularly related to the newer developed areas and ice fishing. Bill Crawford added that some of the recent recreation development changes (e.g., at Jasper Point) were specifically designed to reduce the need for enforcement patrols; this type of focused management is often effective. Patti Llewellyn commented that there are no plans to reduce the level of funding for enforcement, and that this funding is expected to continue at least at current levels for the foreseeable future.

C.4.6 Education and interpretation

As discussed earlier (under ORV use), Jim Hensley noted the need for maps/pamphlets that focus public use in appropriate areas, adding that it's important to explain to people why certain areas are off limits (people tend to be more respectful of resources if they are better informed); they also are more responsive if they know where they can legally go with their ORVs. John Swanson recommended changing "education" to "information," noting that the latter term would be more respectful.

C.4.8 Funding

Passing along a comment from Wayne Shuyler (unable to attend today's AHWG meeting), Vicki noted that the Oregon State Marine Board is a potential funding source for boating-related projects.

IV. OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS MAPPING - A REVIEW

Using GIS plots/maps hanging in the room as examples, Kevin and Kristen explained how Reclamation/OPRD have combined data layers for both opportunities and constraints, overlaying them on various maps to better understand concerns and issues in site-specific areas. OPRD data were initially reviewed, examining that agency's classification of Class 1 to 4 areas (Class 1 representing areas with the highest resource sensitivity and therefore the least appropriate for development). Other layers, such as eagle nesting areas and riparian buffers, were then added to create a more comprehensive composite. This overlaying is most valuable because it identifies potential resource conflicts and highlights the most suitable areas for potential development/expansion. Such mapping provides a useful management tool and represents the first step toward site-specific management. Jim Keany noted that site-specific areas can then be produced at a much larger scale.

V. DRAFT RMP GOALS

Kevin distributed a page of draft RMP goals, described as a "Mom & Apple Pie" level of detail, for AHWG review. Kevin explained that the next step in the process would be to form RMP/MP objectives, based on issues identified in the Problem Statement, that are best organized by the overarching goals. The draft objectives will be available for AHWG review prior to the next AHWG meeting (now scheduled for November 1).

VI. MEETING WRAP-UP

John P. closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their participation and stating that in addition to a review of the draft goals and objectives, the majority of the next AHWG meeting will be spent discussing a preliminary set of plan alternatives.